

**THE BERKSHIRE GAS COMPANY**

**SERVICE QUALITY REPORT**

**For**

**CALENDAR YEAR 2002**

**D.T.E. 03-11**

**March 3, 2003**

## **SECTION ONE**

### **Form A**

<b>Page I-1</b>	<b>Penalty Provision Requirements</b>
<b>Page I-2</b>	<b>Additional Reporting Requirements</b>

## Form A

### The Berkshire Gas Company

**Calendar Year 2002**

Penalty Provisions	Years In Database <sup>(1)</sup>	Mean and Benchmark	Performance in 2002	Comments
Telephone Answering Factor (Calls handled within 45 sec.)	1	Mean - 75.44 %	81.29%	No performance benchmark has been established with respect to telephone answering due to less than 3 years of data.
		Bench - NA		
Non-Emergency Calls (Calls handled within 45 sec.)	1	Mean – 74.88 %	80.67%	No performance benchmark has been established with respect to telephone answering due to less than 3 years of data.
		Bench. – NA		
Emergency Calls (Calls handled within 40 sec.)	1	Mean – 100%	98.99%	No performance benchmark has been established with respect to telephone answering due to less than 3 years of data.
		Bench. - NA		
Telephone Answering Factor (Calls handled within 20 sec.)	0	Mean – NA	68.50%	Consistent with the D.T.E.'s directive, the Company now monitors the telephone answering factor at the 20 second standard.
		Bench - NA		
Non-Emergency Calls (Calls handled within 20 sec.)	0	Mean – NA	67.60%	Consistent with the D.T.E.'s directive, the Company now monitors the telephone answering factor at the 20 second standard.
		Bench. – NA		
Emergency Calls (Calls handled within 20 sec.)	0	Mean – NA	95.15%	Consistent with the D.T.E.'s directive, the Company now monitors the telephone answering factor at the 20 second standard.
		Bench. - NA		
Service Appointments Met As Scheduled	0	Mean – NA	100.00%	The Company was not able to collect this data accurately until early 2002 with the resolution of certain software concerns. In an effort to be helpful, the Company had previously attempted to develop a proxy for this measure that was filed in the 2001 Service Quality Report.
		Bench. - NA		
On-Cycle Monthly Meter Reads	2	Mean - 98.97 %	99.49%	The Company now maintains three years of data for this measure so that a performance benchmark may now be established.
		Bench 98.92 - 99.02 %		
Consumer Division Cases	10	Mean - 48.9 Cases	19 Cases	The Company's performance exceeded the established benchmark.
		Bench. 31.0 - 66.8 Cases		
Billing Adjustments (\$ per 1000 Residential Customers)	10	Mean - \$99.68	\$0.00	The Company's performance exceeded the established benchmark. The Company is pleased to note that 2002 was the second consecutive year in which no residential billing adjustments were necessary.
		Bench \$0.00 - \$205.04		
Lost Time Accident Rate - # of Acc. per 200,000 Employee Hrs.	7	Mean - 11.33	9.36	The Company's performance exceeded the established benchmark.
		Bench 8.31 - 14.35		
Response to Odor Calls	1	Mean - NA	99.93%	No mean or benchmark calculated as performance standard was established by D.T.E. The Company's performance with respect to this measure was strong with only a single call response in December not meeting this standard.
		Bench. – 95%		

**Note: (1)** This column represents historical data for measures that the Company maintained through calendar year 2001. Monthly data for these measures has been presented previously in the Company's Service Quality Report for calendar year 2001 dated March 1, 2002.

## Form A

### The Berkshire Gas Company

**Calendar Year 2002**

Additional Reporting Requirements	Years In Database <sup>(1)</sup>	Mean and Benchmark	Performance in 2002	Comments
Staffing Levels	NA	Mean - 133	128	No benchmark has been established for this reporting requirement. Mean is calculated consistent with the D.T.E.'s February 6, 2003 memorandum. The Company notes that this standard is calculated consistent with G.L. c. 164, §1E. Berkshire notes that this standard reflects changes made pursuant to collective bargaining agreements and the timing of its PBR filing.
		Bench - NA		
Restricted Work Day Rate - # of Days/ 200,000 Emp. Hrs.	1	Mean - 138.04	12.48	No benchmark was established for this measure by the D.T.E.
		Bench - NA		
Property Damage Claims Greater than \$5000	0	Mean - NA	\$0.00	Historical data for this measure was not readily available. No benchmark was established for this measure by the D.T.E.
		Bench - NA		
Unaccounted For Gas Percentage (MCF)	10	Mean - .45 %	0.50%	No benchmark was established for this measure by the D.T.E.
		Bench 0.0 - 0.91 %		
Capital Expenditures Total Dollars	10	Mean (Budget) \$3,075,358	\$2,445,226	Detailed budget information for prior years was presented in the Company's calendar year 2001 Service Quality Report. Comparable information for 2002 is provided at page III-13. No benchmark was established for this measure by the D.T.E.
		Mean (Actual) \$2,907,300	\$2,666,246	
Spare Component & Inventory Policy	NA	Mean - NA	NA	The Company's "Spare Component and Acquisition Inventory Policy and Practice" was presented as Attachment RM-4 to the Company's calendar year 2001 Service Quality Report. The Company has not amended these policies.
		Bench - NA		
Customer Survey -- Random Calls	0	Mean - NA	5.9	Historical data not available in D.T.E. required survey format. No benchmark was established for this measure by the D.T.E. See report of independent survey firm in Section IV.
		Bench - NA		
Customer Survey -- Contact Satisfaction	0	Mean - NA	6.1	Historical data not available in D.T.E. required survey format. No benchmark was established for this measure by the D.T.E. See report of independent survey firm in Section IV.
		Bench. - NA		
Accidents	NA	Mean - NA	0	No back up data is included in this filing as the Company experienced no accidents in calendar year 2001. The Company reports accidents consistent with the requirements of G.L. c.164, §95.
		Bench. - NA		
Cust. Service Guarantees (#, total \$)	0	Mean - NA	Total # - 0	Historical data not available. Standard and penalty established by D.T.E.
		Bench - NA	Total \$ - 0	

**Note: (1)** This column represents historical data for measures that the Company maintained through calendar year 2001. Monthly data for these measures has been presented previously in the Company's Service Quality Report for calendar year 2001 dated March 1, 2002.

## **SECTION TWO**

### **HISTORIC INFORMATION**

<b>Page II-1</b>	<b>Historic Performance – Telephone Service Response</b>
<b>Page II-2</b>	<b>Historic Performance – On-cycle Monthly Meter Reads</b>
<b>Page II-3</b>	<b>Historic Performance – Consumer Division Cases</b>
<b>Page II-4</b>	<b>Historic Performance – Billing Adjustments</b>
<b>Page II-5</b>	<b>Historic Performance – Lost Time Accident Rate</b>
<b>Page II-6</b>	<b>Historic Performance – Response to Odor Calls</b>
<b>Page II-7</b>	<b>Historic Performance – Unaccounted for Gas</b>
<b>Page II-8</b>	<b>Staffing Levels</b>
<b>Page II-9</b>	<b>Historic Performance – Restricted Work-Day Rate</b>
<b>Page II-10</b>	<b>Summary of Capital Spending</b>

## **Historic Performance Telephone Service Response**

**Measure : Total Telephone Calls Answered within 40 & 45  
Seconds**

<b>Year</b>	<b>% of Calls Answered</b>
2001	75.44

**Measure : Non - Emergency Telephone Calls Answered within 45  
Seconds**

<b>Year</b>	<b>% of Calls Answered</b>
2001	74.88

**Measure : Emergency Telephone Calls Answered within 40  
Seconds**

<b>Year</b>	<b>% of Calls Answered</b>
2001	100.00%

**Historic Performance  
On-Cycle Monthly Meter Reads**

<b>Year</b>	<b>% of Actual Reads</b>
2000	98.93
2001	99.00

<b>Standard Deviation</b>	0.05
<b>Historic Average</b>	98.97

**Historic Performance  
Consumer Division Cases  
As Reported by DTE**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>
1992	65
1993	41
1994	72
1995	46
1996	30
1997	46
1998	47
1999	77
2000	45
2001	20

<b>Standard Deviation</b>	17.9
<b>Historic Average</b>	48.9



**Historic Performance  
Billing Adjustments  
Per 1000 Residential Customers  
As reported by DTE**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Res. Billing Adjustments</b>	<b>Total Res. Customers</b>	<b>\$ Adjust Per 1000 Res. Cust</b>
1992	2170.31	27435	\$79.11
1993	158.88	27683	\$5.74
1994	7349.19	27936	\$263.07
1995	7709.04	28317	\$272.24
1996	684.15	28583	\$23.94
1997	1318.42	28609	\$46.08
1998	1830.97	28719	\$63.75
1999	6005.81	29541	\$203.30
2000	1167.77	29532	\$39.54
2001	0.00	29527	\$0.00

<b>Standard Deviation</b>	\$105.36
<b>Historic Average</b>	\$99.68

**Historic Performance  
Lost Time Accident Rate  
Accidents per 200,000  
Employee Hours**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Measurement per Year Lost Work Time Accident Rate</b>
1995	9.11
1996	11.83
1997	6.46
1998	11.59
1999	10.59
2000	14.84
2001	14.90

<b>Standard Deviation</b>	3.02
<b>Historic Average</b>	11.33

**Historic Performance  
Response to Odor Calls**

<b>Year</b>	<b>% of Odor Calls Responded to ? 1 Hour</b>
2001	99.75%

Note: The Company is aware that historic performance is not determinative of a benchmark.

### Historic Performance Unaccounted for Gas

YEAR	Unaccounted For Gas
1992	0.10%
1993	1.00%
1994	0.80%
1995	0.20%
1996	0.40%
1997	0.20%
1998	0.00%
1999	0.20%
2000	0.20%
2001	1.40%

<b>Standard Deviation</b>	0.46%
-------------------------------	-------

<b>Historic Average</b>	0.45%
-----------------------------	-------

Note: Data obtained from US DOT Form RSPA F7100 1-1. Historical data is presented for the twelve-month period ending June 30 in each year consistent with prior reporting practices.

### Staffing Levels

Year	# of Employees
2001	133

Note: Consistent with the Department's February 6, 2003 instructions in docket D.T.E. 99-84, the Company developed the mean staffing levels consistent with the requirements of G.L. c. 164, §1E. Specifically, Section 1E provides that distribution companies that file performance based rate ("PBR") filings may make staff reductions either pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement or after D.T.E. review. Berkshire filed a PBR case in June 2001 and received department approval for such plan on January 31, 2002. All reductions in staff since that time for union employees, as with any prior reductions, have been consistent with the terms of the relevant collective bargaining agreement.

**Historic Performance**  
**Restricted Work-Day Rate**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Restricted Work Day Rate</b>
<u>2001</u>	<u>138.40</u>

## Summary of Capital Spending

Capital Expenditures		
Year	Budget	Actual
1992	2310400	2813488
1993	2845000	2301093
1994	2888000	2365479
1995	3945000	3236595
1996	4190000	3578820
1997	4009000	4332885
1998	2835000	1981820
1999	2533635	2493079
2000	2615000	2248418
2001	2582545	3721323
Mean	3075358	2907300

## **SECTION THREE**

### **CALENDAR YEAR 2002 SUPPORTING DATA**

<b>Page III-1</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Telephone Service Response Data</b>
<b>Page III-2</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Service Appointments Met</b>
<b>Page III-3</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - On-Cycle Monthly Meter Reads</b>
<b>Page III-4</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Consumer Division Cases</b>
<b>Page III-5</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Billing Adjustments</b>
<b>Page III-6</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Lost Time Accident Rate</b>
<b>Page III-7</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Response to Odor Calls</b>
<b>Page III-8</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Restricted Work-Day Rate</b>
<b>Page III-9</b>	<b>Consumer Survey Results</b>
<b>Page III-10</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Customer Service Guarantees</b>
<b>Page III-11</b>	<b>Property Damage Claims</b>
<b>Page III-12</b>	<b>Summary of Performance - Unaccounted for Gas</b>
<b>Page III-13</b>	<b>Staffing Levels</b>
<b>Page III-14</b>	<b>Capital Expenditure Spreadsheet</b>



## Summary of Performance Telephone Service Response Data 2002

### Total Telephone Calls Answered within 40 and 45 Seconds

Month	Calls Answered	Calls Answered in 40 & 45 Sec	GOS% For Month	YTD 40 & 45 Sec
Jan	6107	4868	79.71%	79.71%
Feb	5348	4697	87.83%	83.50%
Mar	5877	5178	88.11%	85.06%
Apr	6433	4942	76.82%	82.83%
May	6443	5248	81.45%	82.54%
Jun	5551	4448	80.13%	82.16%
Jul	5600	4629	82.66%	82.23%
Aug	5183	4602	88.79%	82.96%
Sep	5867	4366	74.42%	82.00%
Oct	6806	5375	78.97%	81.66%
Nov	5499	4401	80.03%	81.52%
Dec	5569	4381	78.67%	81.29%
<b>TOTAL YTD</b>	<b>70283</b>	<b>57135</b>		<b>81.29%</b>

### Non-Emergency Telephone Calls Answered within 45 Seconds

Month	Calls Answered	Calls Answered In 45 Sec	GOS% For Month	YTD 45 Sec
Jan	5914	4675	79.05%	80.67%
Feb	5170	4519	87.41%	80.75%
Mar	5703	5006	87.78%	80.47%
Apr	6223	4734	76.07%	80.12%
May	6260	5070	80.99%	80.34%
Jun	5360	4257	79.42%	80.30%
Jul	5452	4483	82.23%	80.35%
Aug	5007	4426	88.40%	80.24%
Sep	5661	4161	73.50%	79.79%
Oct	6540	5116	78.23%	80.21%
Nov	5283	4185	79.22%	80.38%
Dec	5337	4152	77.80%	80.46%
<b>TOTAL YTD</b>	<b>67910</b>	<b>54784</b>		<b>80.67%</b>

## Summary of Performance Telephone Service Response Data 2002

### Emergency Telephone Calls Answered within 40 Seconds

Month	Calls Answered	Calls Answered in 40 Sec	GOS% For Month	YTD 40 Sec
Jan	193	193	100.00%	100.00%
Feb	178	178	100.00%	100.00%
Mar	174	172	98.85%	99.63%
Apr	210	208	99.05%	99.47%
May	183	178	97.27%	99.04%
Jun	191	191	100.00%	99.20%
Jul	148	146	98.65%	99.14%
Aug	176	176	100.00%	99.24%
Sep	206	205	99.51%	99.28%
Oct	266	259	97.37%	99.01%
Nov	216	214	99.07%	99.02%
Dec	232	229	98.71%	98.99%
<b>TOTAL YTD</b>	<b>2373</b>	<b>2349</b>		<b>98.99%</b>

## Summary of Performance Telephone Service Response Data 2002

### Total Telephone Calls Answered within 20 Seconds

Month	Calls Answered	Calls Answered in 20 Sec	GOS% For Month	YTD 20 Sec
Jan	6107	4391	71.90%	71.90%
Feb	5348	4238	79.24%	75.33%
Mar	5877	4582	77.96%	76.22%
Apr	6433	4203	65.33%	73.28%
May	6443	4320	67.05%	71.95%
Jun	5551	3600	64.85%	70.85%
Jul	5600	3732	66.64%	70.28%
Aug	5183	3941	76.04%	70.92%
Sep	5867	3443	58.68%	69.55%
Oct	6806	4401	64.66%	68.99%
Nov	5499	3669	66.72%	68.80%
Dec	5569	3621	65.02%	68.50%
<b>TOTAL YTD</b>	<b>70283</b>	<b>48141</b>		<b>68.50%</b>

### Non-Emergency Telephone Calls Answered within 20 Seconds

Month	Calls Answered	Calls Answered In 20 Seconds	GOS% For Month	YTD 20 Sec
JANUARY	5914	4204	71.09%	71.09%
FEBRUARY	5170	4064	78.61%	74.59%
MARCH	5703	4415	77.42%	75.55%
APRIL	6223	3999	64.26%	72.50%
MAY	6260	4148	66.26%	71.17%
JUNE	5360	3421	63.82%	70.03%
JULY	5452	3592	65.88%	69.47%
AUGUST	5007	3794	75.77%	70.17%
SEPTEMBER	5661	3248	57.38%	68.74%
OCTOBER	6540	4157	63.56%	68.15%
NOVEMBER	5283	3460	65.49%	67.92%
DECEMBER	5337	3402	63.74%	67.60%
<b>TOTAL YTD</b>	<b>67910</b>	<b>45904</b>		<b>67.60%</b>

**Summary of Performance  
Telephone Service Response Data  
2002**

**Emergency Telephone Calls Answered within 20 Seconds**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Calls Answered</b>	<b>Calls Answered in 20 Sec</b>	<b>GOS% For Month</b>	<b>YTD 20 Sec</b>
Jan	193	187	96.89%	96.89%
Feb	178	174	97.75%	97.30%
Mar	174	167	95.98%	96.88%
Apr	210	204	97.14%	96.95%
May	183	172	93.99%	96.38%
Jun	191	179	93.72%	95.93%
Jul	148	140	94.59%	95.77%
Aug	176	168	95.45%	95.73%
Sep	206	195	94.66%	95.60%
Oct	266	244	91.73%	95.06%
Nov	216	209	96.76%	95.24%
Dec	232	219	94.40%	95.15%
<b>TOTAL YTD</b>	<b>2373</b>	<b>2258</b>		<b>95.15%</b>

**Summary of Performance  
Service Appointments Met  
2002**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Same Day</b>	<b>Not The Same Day</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Done on Same Day</b>	<b>YTD</b>
Jan	1763	0	1763	<b>See Note</b>	<b>See Note</b>
Feb	1557	0	1557	<b>See Note</b>	<b>See Note</b>
Mar	335	0	335	100.00	100.00
Apr	493	0	493	100.00	100.00
May	762	0	762	100.00	100.00
Jun	795	0	795	100.00	100.00
Jul	941	0	941	100.00	100.00
Aug	783	0	783	100.00	100.00
Sep	891	0	891	100.00	100.00
Oct	967	0	967	100.00	100.00
Nov	754	0	754	100.00	100.00
Dec	583	0	583	100.00	100.00

Note: The Company resolved certain software concerns in its information systems in early 2002. The Company believes that service appointments in January and February were met as scheduled. The Company's not able to generate data confirming such measures with the same degree of reliability as is available for the remainder of 2002.

**Summary of Performance  
On-Cycle Monthly Meter Reads  
2002**

<b>2002 Month</b>	<b>Total Reads</b>	<b>Estimated Reads</b>	<b>Actual Reads</b>	<b>Monthly Percentage</b>	<b>Measurement Period to Date</b>
Jan-02	34894	201	34693	99.42	99.42
Feb-02	35036	196	34840	99.44	99.43
Mar-02	34963	203	34760	99.42	99.43
Apr-02	34897	157	34740	99.55	99.46
May-02	34902	125	34777	99.64	99.50
Jun-02	34885	156	34729	99.55	99.50
Jul-02	34829	187	34642	99.46	99.50
Aug-02	32382	215	32167	99.34	99.48
Sep-02	34838	165	34673	99.53	99.48
Oct-02	34839	184	34655	99.47	99.48
Nov-02	34861	174	34687	99.50	99.49
Dec-02	34526	141	34385	99.59	99.49
<b>Total</b>	<b>415852</b>	<b>2104</b>	<b>413748</b>	<b>99.49</b>	<b>99.49</b>

**Summary of Performance  
Consumer Division Cases  
2002  
(As Reported by DTE)**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>	<b>Year to Date Total</b>
<b>Jan</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Feb</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mar</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Apr</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>May</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Jun</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Jul</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Aug</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Sep</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Oct</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Nov</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Dec</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>

**Summary of Performance**  
**Billing Adjustments**  
**2002**  
**(As Reported by DTE)**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Total Res. Billing Adjustments</b>	<b>Total Res. Customers</b>	<b>Monthly Billing Adj Per 1000 Res Cust.</b>	<b>YTD \$ Adjust Per 1000 Res Cust.</b>
Jan	0	29570	0.00	0.00
Feb	0	29616	0.00	0.00
Mar	0	29591	0.00	0.00
Apr	0	29426	0.00	0.00
May	0	29245	0.00	0.00
Jun	0	29098	0.00	0.00
Jul	0	28991	0.00	0.00
Aug	0	29016	0.00	0.00
Sep	0	29145	0.00	0.00
Oct	0	29512	0.00	0.00
Nov	0	29709	0.00	0.00
Dec	0	29860	0.00	0.00
Totals	0	29398	0.00	0.00



**Summary of Performance  
Lost Time Accident Rate  
2002**

Month	Hours Worked	Totals	MTD Hours per 200 Employees	Number of Accidents Monthly	Number of Accidents YTD	Accident Rate YTD	Number of Accidents Monthly
Jan	21833	21833	16666.67	0	0	0.00	2
Feb	19757	41590	33333.33	3	3	2.40	2
Mar	26446	68036	50000.00	0	3	2.20	0
Apr	20987	89023	66666.67	1	4	3.00	1
May	21588	110611	83333.33	0	4	3.01	0
June	20399	131010	100000.00	3	7	5.34	3
July	20217	151227	116666.67	1	8	6.17	1
Aug	25798	177025	133333.33	1	9	6.78	1
Sept	19924	196949	150000.00	1	10	7.62	1
Oct	21100	218049	166666.67	1	11	8.41	1
Nov	19289	237338	183333.33	0	11	8.50	0
Dec	19164	256502	200000.00	1	12	9.36	1

**Summary of Performance  
Response to Odor Calls  
2002**

<b>Month</b>	<b># of Odor Calls</b>	<b># Over 60 Minutes</b>	<b>Monthly % Responded to in 60 Min or Less</b>	<b>YTD % Responded to in 60 Min or Less</b>
Jan	109	0	100.00	100.00
Feb	86	0	100.00	100.00
Mar	106	0	100.00	100.00
Apr	129	0	100.00	100.00
May	116	0	100.00	100.00
Jun	112	0	100.00	100.00
Jul	98	0	100.00	100.00
Aug	127	0	100.00	100.00
Sep	127	0	100.00	100.00
Oct	160	0	100.00	100.00
Nov	128	0	100.00	100.00
Dec	127	1	99.21	99.93

**Summary of Performance  
Restricted Work-Day Rate  
2002**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Hours Worked</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>MTD Hours per Employees</b>	<b>Restricted Work- Days Per Month</b>	<b>Restricted Work- Days YTD</b>	<b>Restricted Work-Day Rate YTD</b>	<b>Restricted Work- Days Monthly</b>
Jan	21833	21833	16666.67	0	0	0.00	0
Feb	19757	41590	33333.33	0	0	0.00	0
Mar	26446	68036	50000.00	0	0	0.00	0
Apr	20987	89023	66666.67	0	0	0.00	0
May	21588	110611	83333.33	0	0	0.00	0
June	20399	131010	100000.00	2	2	1.53	2
July	20217	151227	116666.67	0	2	1.54	0
Aug	25798	177025	133333.33	0	2	1.51	0
Sept	19924	196949	150000.00	0	2	1.52	0
Oct	21100	218049	166666.67	14	16	12.23	14
Nov	19289	237338	183333.33	0	16	12.36	0
Dec	19164	256502	200000.00	0	16	12.48	0

## Consumer Survey Results 2002

### Berkshire Gas Company 2002 Customer Contact Survey

Question: Using a scale of 1= very dissatisfied and 7= very satisfied, how satisfied were you with the service you received from the customer call center at Berkshire Gas.

	Overall		Residential		Commercial	
No. Cases>	394	100%	350	100%	44	100%
1	12	3%	11	3%	1	2%
2	5	1%	5	1%	0	0%
3	4	1%	4	1%	0	0%
4	7	2%	6	2%	1	2%
5	42	11%	35	10%	7	16%
6	36	9%	33	9%	3	7%
7	274	70%	246	70%	28	64%
Don't know	14	4%	10	3%	4	9%
Wt. Avg	6.1					

### Berkshire Gas Company 2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey

Question: Using a scale of 1= very dissatisfied and 7= very satisfied, how satisfied were you with the service you are receiving from Berkshire Gas.

	Residential	
No. Cases>	350	100%
1	7	2%
2	4	1%
3	8	2%
4	8	2%
5	46	13%
6	54	15%
7	208	59%
Don't know	15	4%
Wt. Avg	5.9	

Note: These surveys were performed by an independent firm, Research International. See Section IV for the summary report of Research International.

**Summary of Performance  
Customer Service Guarantees  
2002**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Number Paid Out Monthly</b>	<b>Dollars Paid Out Monthly</b>	<b>Number Paid Out YTD</b>	<b>Dollars Paid Out YTD</b>
Jan	0	0	0	0.00
Feb	0	0	0	0.00
Mar	0	0	0	0.00
Apr	0	0	0	0.00
May	0	0	0	0.00
Jun	0	0	0	0.00
Jul	0	0	0	0.00
Aug	0	0	0	0.00
Sep	0	0	0	0.00
Oct	0	0	0	0.00
Nov	0	0	0	0.00
Dec	0	0	0	0.00
Total YTD			0	0.00

**Property Damage Claims  
2002**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Number Paid Out Monthly</b>	<b>Dollars Paid Out Monthly</b>	<b>Number Paid Out YTD</b>	<b>Dollars Paid Out YTD</b>
Jan	0	0	0	0.00
Feb	0	0	0	0.00
Mar	0	0	0	0.00
Apr	0	0	0	0.00
May	0	0	0	0.00
Jun	0	0	0	0.00
Jul	0	0	0	0.00
Aug	0	0	0	0.00
Sep	0	0	0	0.00
Oct	0	0	0	0.00
Nov	0	0	0	0.00
Dec	0	0	0	0.00
Total YTD			0	0.00

Note: This measures claims in excess of \$5,000. Because no such claims were made in 2002, no back-up data is provided with this filing.

**Summary of Performance  
Unaccounted for Gas  
2002**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Total Sendout Dekatherms</b>	<b>Unaccounted For Gas Dekatherms</b>	<b>YTD % Dekatherms</b>
January	952878	(34523)	-3.623%
February	861768	(93966)	-10.904%
March	850927	53711	6.312%
April	653028	(106619)	-16.327%
May	574098	(41804)	-7.282%
June	373171	(63007)	-16.884%
July	334347	(6957)	-2.081%
August	319356	2862	0.896%
September	352148	3726	1.058%
October	644039	148371	23.038%
November	818826	60429	7.380%
December	1028535	116645	11.341%
<b>Total</b>	7763121	38868	0.501%

Note: Data obtained from US DOT Form RSPA F7100 1-1.

### Staffing Levels

Year	# of Employees
2002	128

Note: Consistent with the Department's February 6, 2003 instructions in docket D.T.E. 99-84, the Company developed the mean staffing levels consistent with the requirements of G.L. c. 164, §1E. Specifically, Section 1E provides that distribution companies that file performance based rate ("PBR") filings may make staff reductions either pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement or after D.T.E. review. Berkshire filed a PBR case in June 2001 and received department approval for such plan on January 31, 2002. All reductions in staff since that time for union employees, as with any prior reductions, have been consistent with the terms of the relevant collective bargaining agreement. Data is presented as of December 31, 2002.



## Capital Expenditure Spreadsheet 2002

Description	Budget	Actual
Replacement Services	247,000	349,321
Service Improvements	144,000	162,945
System Improvements	209,000	279,865
Main Replacement - Bare Steel	109,500	119,508
Short Main Replacements	50,000	53,582
Cast Iron Main Replacement	47,000	115,768
Main Clamping	18,000	21,725
Main Replacement - DPW Projects	720,000	573,427
Corrosion Control	27,000	0
New Meters	181,523	151,489
Meter Connections	373,000	458,776
Automated Meter Reading	0	0
Production Plant Improvements	26,000	10,439
Tools & Work Equipment	75,202	93,948
Reactivation Program	0	0
General Retirements	140,000	190,429
Inactive Services	78,000	85,024
<b>TOTAL CAPITAL BUDGET</b>	<b>2,445,225</b>	<b>2,666,246</b>

## 2002 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE INFORMATION

As required by D.T.E. Order 99-84, Attachment 1, Section 8.E, the following report lists capital investment projects that relate to maintaining transmission and distribution reliability. The report contains the location and cost of modification, upgrade, replacement, and/or construction as well as a summary description of the project.

PROJECT NAME/REF	LOCATION	COST	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION
Highland Ave	Pittsfield	77,635	Regulator pit work
Renfrew St	Adams	40,106	Relocate regulator pit
Barr Ave	Greenfield	48,512	Install new main for system improvement
Canal St	Turners Falls	81,554	Install new main for system improvement
Silver St	Greenfield	56,980	Retire and renew bare steel main
Bradley St	Lee	38,020	Retire and renew bare steel main
East Main St	Stockbridge	1,515	Retire and renew bare steel main
Apremont St	Adams	4,383	Short main replacement
Hadley Shopping Center	Hadley	2,258	Short main replacement
Narragansett Ave	Lanesboro	297	Short main replacement
Narragansett Ave	Lanesboro	1,237	Short main replacement
Hitchcock Rd	Amherst	315	Short main replacement
Federal St	Greenfield	7,485	Retire and renew cast iron main
Adam St	Pittsfield	41,745	Retire and renew cast iron main
Service Rd	Amherst	15,293	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Cole Ave	Williamstown	24,857	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Center St	Pittsfield	74,139	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Southworth St	Williamstown	54,088	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Church St	Williamstown	39,459	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Richmond St	Adams	14,318	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Gregory Ave	North Adams	38,487	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Haley St	Williamstown	32,558	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
E Quincy St	North Adams	65,149	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Wats on St	Pittsfield	50,758	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Berkshire Mall	Lanesboro	9,412	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
North St	Williamstown	112,878	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project

Pleasant St	Adams	8,154	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Enterprise St	Adams	45,646	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Pittsfield Rd	Lenox	3,698	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Dalton Ave	Pittsfield	668	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Fairview St	Lee	1,452	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Maple St	Greenfield	1,124	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Summerfield Rd	Amherst	3,989	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project
Church St	Cheshire	2,698	Retire and renew main due to town DPW project

TOTAL 1,000,867

## **SECTION FOUR**

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Page IV -1      Background Data – Customer Survey Report

RESEARCH INTERNATIONAL

MEMO



**Residential Customer Survey Letter  
From Research International**

TO Chris Farrell  
FROM Earl Taylor  
DATE 2/21/2003

RE: 2002 Customer Satisfaction and Contact Satisfaction Results

In December 2002, Berkshire Gas Company commissioned Research International to conduct separate customer satisfaction surveys of its overall customer base and of customers who had recently contacted its Call Center. Each survey was based on a representative random sample.

For the **overall customer satisfaction survey**, a random selection of residential customers was drawn from Berkshire Gas customer files, and 350 residential interviews were completed. Residential customers were screened to be the adult (co)head of the household, excluding anyone who works for a utility or market research company.

For the **contact satisfaction survey**, the names and telephone numbers of customers contacting the Berkshire Gas Call Center during November 2002 were recorded. These customers were then contacted randomly in December 2002 to yield completed interviews with 394 customers (350 residential and 44 business). Respondents were screened to be the individuals who had called the Call Center in the previous month.

Results for the **overall customer satisfaction survey** show that three in four (74%) customers give Berkshire Gas a 6 or 7 on a 7-point scale of satisfaction "*with the service you are receiving from your natural Gas company, Berkshire Gas.*" These results are reliable +/- 5 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. That is, allowing for tolerated sampling error, in 19 of 20 cases, results observed from a repeat of this survey would be within the range of 69% to 79%.

Results for the **contact satisfaction survey** show that 79% of customers contacting Berkshire Gas in November 2002 gave a 6 or 7 on a 7-point scale of satisfaction "*with the service you received from the customer call center of Berkshire Gas.*" These results are reliable +/- 4 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. That is, allowing for tolerated sampling error, in 19 of 20 cases, results observed from a repeat of this survey would be within the range of 75% to 83%.

We are confident that results of both these surveys accurately reflect customer satisfaction with Berkshire Gas, overall and with the Call Center. Our experience conducting similar research for gas and electric utilities across North America for over 25 years suggests that Berkshire Gas provided excellent service to its customers in 2002.

Sincerely,

Earl L. Taylor, Ph.D.  
Senior Vice President